preserve Pages 1-7

App F IX-1

Previous References
T.L 36-35 (15, 16, 17)
ML 33-32 (83, 84, 85)
ML 33-32 (39 & 44)
Letter References
ML 36-35-H 38, 39, 44-49

1935-6 (ML)

File No 36-35
Serial Nos. 36 & 37

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos two ✓

Part B for March 1936

SUBJECT.

Acquisition of properties in Hanumandapur village, Bangalore to be required for the extension to the East of Sulebele Chattram Road, Bangalore City

No. L 6659 dt 28 2.36
To the Ml. Comr. Bangalore city
thro' the President

Calls for further particulars re—

WD 03607—GPB—22 500—2-8-35

ER
T 3/36

3810/L

General and Revenue Secretariat | Ml File No 36 of 1935 | [App F III—2

Serial No	
36	Letter No L1 2052 dated 17-2-36 from the Municipal Commissioner, Bangalore city forwarding for sanction final declaration statements for the acquisition of properties in Hanumanthapura Village, Bangalore Taluk required for an extension to the east of Subedar Chattram Road, Bangalore at The cost of acquisition is estimated at Rs 69,166
A x	According to Rule 3 of the rules issued under G O No G 748-816/P.H 87-30-2 dated 24/27-7-1931 all sanitary works costing more than Rs 30,000 have to be approved by the Central Health Committee
A	As the layout of an extension is in the nature of a Sanitary work, the approval of the Central Health Committee is perhaps necessary
B x	As per G O No R 1459-518/LR 93-35-2 dated 6-9-1935, the Municipal Commissioner should consult the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore Dt in respect of acquisition cases in which the award is likely to exceed Rs 10,000 It is not clear whether in the present case the Deputy Commissioner has been consulted in the matter. Submitted for orders
	RDM 24/2 A Has this procedure been followed in similar cases in the past? Please put up refes HM 26/2

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—18 7 35

Extension to the east of Subedar Chattram Road,

2

Mz File No 36 B 810 / L 2510 / J Bangalore city of 1935

General and Revenue Secretariat

Kind reference is invited to this office letter No L 2564 dated 10-10-32 to the Municipal Comm, B. city requesting him to consult the Central Health Committee in regard the acquisition of properties in Hanumanthapur Village for laying out an extension. (See flag 2 ante)

Draft to the Municipal Commr as personally directed is submitted for approval

Rem mz 27/2

chiefsec) tm 27/2

28/2

Issue tm 28/2

(Mz 33-32-44)

^{x}

CHIEF SECTT 27 FEB 1935

The Municipal Commissioner, Bangalore city

No L 6659 dated 2-3-35

Requests him to consult the Central Health Committee and the D.C. Bangalore on the proposal and return the papers.

37

28 FEB 1935 L & REV SECTT

B mz 4/3 9/3

Mr Rau
L. - 2052 - M/19/2

Ml 36-35-36 1

No Encl Declaration Forms + (5) form of objections

City Municipal Office,

Bangalore, dated 12th Feb 193 6

3810/L.

From

M SESHADRI, ESQ, M A,
Municipal Commissioner,
Bangalore City

CHIEF SECRETARY TO
19 FEB 1936
19/2

To

A.V.Ramanathan, Esq., B.A.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore

Sir,

Bad Encls. 5, 17

With reference to the Government Notification No. L 2508/M1 36-35-16 dated 8th October 1935 authorising the Special Land - Acquisition Officer to hear objections under section 5(a) of the Land Acquisition Regulation in respect of the acquisition of certain properties in Hanumanthapur village, Bangalore Kasaba, Bangalore Taluk, required for an extension to the east of Subedar Chattram road, I have the honour to report that five objections petitions (herein enclosed) were received from the interested parties.

Guldm Dasthagir owner of survey No. 37 states that half of stone reveted Kalyani belonging to him is shown as belonging to Subbarayappa mutt in the notification, that stone slabs measuring about 250 R.Ft. and also one well are omitted in the notification, that he sold a portion of this survey land to Mr. Balakrishniah and others and that some houses have already sprung up on the survey number which cannot therefore be considered as - agricultural land. He finally objects to the acquisition on the ground that he may himself be permitted to lay out his land into building sites.

The Mutt and the pond are not known as Subbarayan Mutt as stated by the party but they are known as "Nanjappaswami Mutt " This correction, is embodied in the final Declaration Statement,

P.T.O.

submitted herewith.

The stone slabs alleged to have been omitted form part of the Kalyani iteself and cannot be separately valued.

With regard to his objection that a portion of this Survey No. 37 has been sold to Messers Balakrishniya and Thimmiah, Sons of Ettige Nagappa, these latter have also been included as parties interested in the property under acquisition. The well alleged to have been omitted is also brought on the final notification and Mr. Dastagiri's contention that his survey number cannot be considered as agricultural land merely because some houses have since sprung up cannot be accepted in as much as he does not appear to have paid the conversion fine to convert it into building sites. As regards his last objection it is not possible to grant the permission sought for since the Municipal Council have sanctioned this acquisition and are naturally averse to allow private persons to lay out sites as they choose.

Mr. B. Narayanaswamy Iyengar and others also object to the acquisition of S.Nos. 38 and 39 on the ground that they are quite prepared to meet the cost of layout and that they may therefore be permitted to make use of the sites purchased from the owner of S.No. 38. This request cannot be considered as the Municipal Council have already sanctioned the acquisition of these lands and have to take up the work of layout themselves.

Pujari Narayanappa and others owners of S.Nos. 37 have stated in their objection petition 1) that the property notified as belonging to Subbarayappa mutt is not correct, that it belongs to Manjappaswamy Mutt, 2) that the measurements notified are not correct, that the pond and the vacant land cover 9 guntas and 14 Sq. Yds. and not 6 guntas as notified -

[Please see the annexed Sheet

and 3) that the temple other portions acquired by paying compensation at Rs. 10/- per Sq.Yd.

No item 1 of his objections has been rectified and incorporated on the enclosed final declaration statement. The other obections will be invetigated in detail at the time of passing awards.

Malavally Kamaiah and Chindagiriah state in their - objection petition 1) that the temple and Chatram portions ~~being charitable institutions~~ being Charitable institutions of S.No. 34 and 39 may not be - acquired. 2) that compensation should not be paid to Thimmiah notified as owner since the property is meant for public charity. With regard to item No. 1 it is not possible to drop the acquisition proceedings as the Council have finally decided to acquire the ~~xxxxxx~~ properties. The other objection will be considered at the time of passing the award.

Sri Nanjamma in her objection petition ~~dated~~ that - compensation in respect of S.No. 32-31/1 ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ to be - awarded should not be paid to Lakshmmah as she is also interested in the properties proposed to be acquired. This will be considered at the time of award. Her name is now included as one of the interested parties in the final notification.

Final declaration statements in English and Kannada (in duplicate are herewith sent for favour~~xx~~ of kind ~~consideration~~. publicaton.

The cost of acquisition will be Rs. 69,166/- inclusive of statutory allowances at 15/-% and will be met out of Municipal funds provided under D3 Compensation in the current years' Budget of the Municipality.

I request that sanction of Government may kindly be - obtained to the acquisition and Municipal Commissioner authorised

P TO.

to take order for the acquisition of these properties.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

PSM.

Municipal Commissioner.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

Section Ml

File No 36-35

Serial No 37

Diary No of letter replied to

No L 6659 Encl Records.

To

The Municipal Commissioners,
Bangalore city
(through the President)

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Sir,

Date of issue 2nd March 1936

Signed by M. A. S.

With reference to your letter No L1-2052 dated 17-2-36 forwarding for sanction final declaration statements for the acquisition of properties in Hanumanthapur Village, Bangalore Taluk required for an extension to the east of Subedar Chattram Road, at a cost of Rs 69,166/- Bangalore city, I am directed to invite reference to G O No 748-8.16/ P H 87-30-2 dated 24/27-7-1931 according to which all sanitary works costing more than Rs 30,000 have to be approved by the Central

A*

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 03601—GPB—30,000—23 9 35

6

Health Committee and to Y.O No

R1459-518/LR 93-35-2 dated 6-9-35 B×

directing that in respect of accounting

cases in Bangalore city in which

the award is likely to exceed Rs10,000.

the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore Dt,

~~to be~~ be consulted and to enquire

whether the above formalities have

been observed in the present case If this has not been done, necessary action may be taken and the papers returned for the orders of Govt

-- The records accompany -- ----

I have etc

28/2

27/2 Chief Secy to Govt

Rmm

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 28th February 1936.

No L 6659 Encl Records.

From

The *Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore*

To

The Municipal Commissioner,
Bangalore City,
THROUGH the President, City Municipal Council,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.L1.2052 dated 17th February 1936, forwarding for sanction final declaration statements for the acquisition of properties in Hanumanthapur Village, Bangalore Taluk, required for an extension to the east of Subedar Chattram Road, Bangalore City at a cost of Rs.69,166/- I am directed to invite reference to Government Order No.G.748-816/P.H.87-30-2 dated 24th/27th July 1931, according to which all sanitary works costing more than Rs.30,000/- have to be approved by the Central Health Committee and to Government Order No.R.1459-518/L.S. 93-35-2 dated the 6th September 1935, directing that in respect of acquisition cases in Bangalore City in which the award is likely to exceed Rs.10,000/- the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District, be consulted and to enquire whether the above formalities have been observed in the present case. If this has not been done, necessary action may be taken and the papers resubmitted for the orders of Government.

The records accompany.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Jain Draft)

For Chief Secretary to Government.

P 2